

**REMARKS**

Claims 27-37 are under examination.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 27 for some informalities. Claim 27 has been amended.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 27 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner suggests there is new matter in the arrangement of bonding.

Applicants respectfully submit that the arrangement of bonding is not new matter. Any additional language serves to simply clarify the inherencies already present in the claim language. The Examiner suggested this claim language in the previous Office Action. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

The Examiner suggests that the claim is obvious in view of Boschetti and Chen. Applicants respectfully disagree. In fact, the Examiner states that even Boschetti and Chen do not disclose each element of the claimed invention, but rather has to reach out and rely on yet another “obvious variant of the polymer.” There is no enabling disclosure on how this could be achieved.

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no suggestion that the combination of Chen and Boschetti would result in the claimed invention. Furthermore, as stated by the Examiner, one skilled in the art would have to go beyond even the references cited to experiment with the “obvious variant” of the polymer. There is no motivation to combine or even to try to combine these references. There certainly is no expectation of success. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

The size description in claim 30 was originally presented in the application in claim 13. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration as to the 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejection.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 27 as being indefinite. Applicants have reviewed the rejection and the Claim. Applicants are uncertain as to the Examiner's rejection and respectfully request reconsideration along with a further explanation.

Claim 31 has been amended to remove the term limited. Applicants respectfully submit that "nonspecific absorption" is a term of art well known by those skilled in the field.

Claims 33 and 37 have been rejected. Applicants have reviewed the rejection and the Claims. Applicants are uncertain as to the Examiner's rejection and respectfully request reconsideration along with a further explanation.

Application Serial No.: 10/627,143  
Applicant(s): Spector et al.

Docket No.: N.C. 84,766

Any extension of time necessary to avoid abandonment of this application is hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and any fees required are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0281.

Applicant believes that the above constitutes a full and complete reply and that the stated grounds for rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated or rendered moot. In view of the above remarks, Applicants believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and promptly withdraw the outstanding objections and rejections. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned for any reason so as to expedite the examination of this application

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen T. Hunnius/

Stephen T. Hunnius  
Reg. No. 48,304  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Code 1008.2  
4555 Overlook Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20375-5325  
(202) 404-1554